CCPA

Remarks

The present response is to the Office Action mailed in the above referenced case on October 18, 2005. Claims 43-81 are pending in the application. Claims 43, 45-49, 52-54, and 56-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Langseth et al. (US 6,662,195) hereinafter Langseth, in view of Fields et el. (US 6,539,420) hereinafter Fields. Claims 44, 50-51, 55, and 68-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Langseth, in view of Fields and further in view of Jamtgaard et al. (US 6,430,624) hereinafter Jamtgaard.

Applicant has carefully reviewed the prior art references provided by the Examiner, and the Examiner's statements and rejections of the instant Office Action. In response to the Examiner's merit rejections of applicant's claims 43-81, applicant herein amends the independent claims to more particularly point out subject matter that is clearly patentable over the art provided by the Examiner. Applicant provides valid reasoning and arguments which clearly show that applicant's claims, as amended, are patentable over the art.

Applicant amends the independent claims to positively recite that the system provides configuration templates to users for use in configuring at least part of the user profile at least specifying a format for that user's Internet-capable appliance, enabling the system to send data for display to the user in the required format of the Internet-capable device.

The Examiner kindly presented a "Response to Arguments" section in the instant Office Action, stating that the majority of applicant's previous arguments are directed to the template used providing a "format specified by the user in the template" which would be used for the Internet device, but applicant has failed to claim the argued features in the claims.

Applicant's claims, as amended, now include said format limitation in the independent claims 43, 54 and 71. In applicant's invention, the user's receiving

device may be a light computing device, i.e. PalmTM, or the Motorola Elite AdvisorTM, usually capable of one way communication with the system. These devices are unable to receive and display data as a full computing system, i.e. a desktop computer would. Applicant's invention provides pre-programmed templates allowing the user to set a specific information receiving profile and format for their special computing device, enabling them to receive their desired information in the format required by their computing device.

The Examiner states that Langseth teaches a network based system for providing data to requesting users, however, Langseth fails to teach, wherein the system provides pre-programmed configuration templates to users for use in configuring the user profile for that user. The Examiner relies on Fields to teach pre-programmed configuration templates to users for use in configuring the user profile for that user.

Applicant argues that Fields primarily provides templates to configure data for display on a Web site (Fig. 4, Abstract, col. 5, lines 1-11). Fields specifically teaches that images are parsed from a data feed, possibly transformed, and are placed in a template Web page and served to the customer. Applicant provides a system and method for providing pre-programmed templates for defining a user's receiving device display parameters and format, wherein the system serves data to the user in the format specified by the user in the template.

Applicant believes that independent claims 43, 54 and 71, as amended, have been shown to be clearly patentable over the art of Langseth and Fields. Dependent claims 44-53, 55-70 and 72-81 are patentable on their own merits, or at least, as depended from a patentable claim.

As all of the claims standing for examination have been demonstrated to be patentable over the art of record, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, and that the present case be passed quickly to issue. If there are any time extensions needed beyond any extension specifically requested with this response, such extension of time is hereby requested. If there are any fees due

- 12 -

beyond any fees paid with this amendment, authorization is given to deduct such fees from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted, Karen Eleanor Board et al.

By [Denald R. Beys] Donald R. Boys Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency P.O. Box 187 Aromas, CA 95004 (831) 726-1457